2075

Liberty

NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER — PROUDHON

Vol. XI.—No. 9. NEW YORK, N. Y., SEPTEMBER 7, 1895. Whole No. 321.

"For always in thine eyes, O Liberty!
Shines that high light whereby the world is saved;
And though thou slay us, we will trust in thee."
JOHN [illegible]

On Picket Duty.

Switzerland will probably have a government bank. The federal chambers have passed a law providing for such an institution, and a referendum is to be had on the subject. In view of recent State Socialistic tendencies, the "ideal democracy" will doubtless vote overwhelmingly for money monopoly. Yet our direct legislationists continue to claim that the referendum is the palladium of liberty.

Goldwin Smith has an admirable article in the August number of the "North American Review," in which he lays bare the sophistries and hollow pretensions of Kidd, Drummond, and Balfour, the alleged leaders of the alleged reaction against the evolutionary philosophy which newspaper wiseacres have been discovering. The people to whom the houses built upon the sand by Kidd, Drummond, & Co. appear so substantial are those who never had the brains to assimilate the first truths of evolutionary philosophy. To the discoveries of the ignorant there is no limit. Of the past they know nothing, and hence all questions are open to them.

A propos of my recent article on "L'Enfant Terrible," I am asked by a correspondent if I would "passively see a woman throw her baby into the fire as a man throws his newspaper." I expected that this question would be put to me; hence it finds me prepared. I answer that it is highly probable that I would personally interfere in such a case. But it is as probable, and perhaps more so, that I would personally interfere to prevent the owner of a masterpiece by Titian from applying the torch to the canvas. My interference in the former case no more invalidates the mother's property right in her child than my interference in the latter case would invalidate the property right of the owner of the painting. If I interfere in either case, I am an invader, acting in obedience to my injured feelings. As such I deserve to be punished. I consider that it would be the duty of a policeman in the service of the defence association to arrest me for assault. On my arraignment I should plead guilty, and it would be the duty of the jury to impose a penalty upon me. I might ask for a light sentence on the strength of the extenuating circumstances, and I believe that my prayer would be heeded. But, if such invasions as mine were persisted in, it would become the duty of the jury to impose penalties sufficiently severe to put a stop to them.

In a review of Dr. Shaw's "Municipal Government in Great Britain," the London "Economic Journal," a periodical no one will accuse of radicalism, writes as follows: "The chief objection which British readers will be inclined to make to the work is that it is altogether too eulogistic. Dr. Shaw admires everything, even the sanitary system of Manchester. He thinks Oldham 'a fine town.' Oldham can justly claim many merits, but certainly the beauty and magnificence suggested by the word 'fine' are not among them. Almost every municipal enterprise, according to Dr. Shaw's account, is either successful or on the point of becoming successful. Doubtless the outside inquirer has some excuse for a too lenient view. He is dependent largely on information furnished to him by people engaged in the business he is describing, and these naturally show him only the best side of things. If by any chance they admit error, he is scarcely in a position to make use of the information." This is very significant. Perhaps a less conservative reviewer would find in the "facts" (which Mr. Bliss admonishes us to study) even less warrant for eulogy than the "Economic Journal." So far only those have testified to the success of what is denominated "municipal Socialism" who had set out with a bias in its favor or who do not know a fact when they see it. The true account of the English municipal experiments yet remains to be written.

If anybody still doubts that Nordau is crazy, let him read the "Forum" article, in which Nordau tells society how it may protect itself from the degenerates and check the progress of the malady propagated by them. What do we do with lepers, small-pox victims, and other sufferers from loathsome diseases? he asks. The answer is, of course, that we isolate them, and do not allow them to have any intercourse with the normal members of the community. Well, says Nordau, do the same to the degenerates. He does not, indeed, advocate their imprisonment, but he urges a general boycott of them and their work by the press. It is to the newspapers that he chiefly appeals; to them he looks for the salvation of society. If they should determine to ignore the degenerates and say nothing about their activities, the rising generation would never learn about their existence and would thus escape all danger of contagion. Unless the newspapers undertake this humanitarian work, Nordau sees no salvation for society. Now, isn't the man who talks such stuff hopelessly crazy? Even the editors laugh at this amazing piece of imbecility. To proclaim the modern editors as the only hope of society beats the record of all lunatic asylums. Let no one think it is merely an attempt of a charlatan to flatter a gullible and vain mob; the extravagance of the conceit is such that it cannot possibly be treated as a hypocritical pretence. No, the fellow meant it, and hopeless lunacy alone can account for it.

The New York saloon-keepers have given up their fight, and have passed resolutions in favor of due and complete submission to the Sunday law. No change of heart is responsible for this decision to sin no more; two or three saloon-keepers had been sentenced by the stern and virtuous Recorder Goff, whose blatant talk shows that he knows very little law and still less logic, to brief terms of imprisonment instead of the usual fine, and their brethren, panic-stricken, fairly fell over each other in the rush to secure the recorder's favor by pleading guilty and paying light fines. Naturally enough, Roosevelt and his supporters claim a signal triumph for law and order, and congratulate themselves on having conclusively demonstrated to the "criminal classes and their allies" that laws can be enforced regardless of their unpopularity, provided honest and courageous officials do their duty. As a matter of fact, the result of this fight proves no such thing. Had the saloon-keepers been governed by principle; had they intelligently and deliberately set out to nullify the absurd Sunday law by systematic and organized resistance,—fifty Roosevelts would have been utterly powerless to offer the least opposition. There are eight thousand saloons in New York, it is said; there are, in addition, hotels, restaurants, and other public houses equally interested in defeating laws against the sale of liquors on Sunday: what could the authorities do if even half of this number chose to openly defy the law? It would be impossible even to arrest all the guilty parties, to say nothing of trying them all in accordance with legal requirements. The whole judicial and executive machinery would be utterly demoralized, and, after some vain and ridiculous attempts to cope with such a movement, they would have to acknowledge themselves beaten and surrender to the law-breakers. The reason the Sunday law can be enforced by a Roosevelt is that those immediately concerned in fighting it lack intelligence and unity. The same is true of other tyrannical and antiquated laws doubtless, but this Sunday fight should have made the lesson obvious to the dullest. The decision of the court that saloon-keepers were entitled to trial by jury really meant victory for the latter, but they were not prepared to improve their opportunity. Roosevelt has won, but let him understand why he has won.

Liberty.

Issued Fortnightly at Two Dollars a Year; Single Copies, Eight Cents.

BENJ. R. TUCKER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Office of Publication, 24 Gold Street.

Post Office Address: LIBERTY, P. O. Box No. 1312, New York, N. Y.

Entered at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

NEW YORK, N. Y., SEPTEMBER 7, 1895.

"In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolishes at one stroke the sword of the executioner, the seal of the magistrate, the club of the policeman, the gauge of the exciseman, the erasing-knife of the department clerk, all those insignia of Politics, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel." — PROUDHON.

☞ The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

The Case Against the New Typography.

In an editorial on "Printing Reform" the "Union Printer and American Craftsman" attempts to show that the method of typography employed in Liberty is inferior to the prevailing method artistically and not superior to it economically. Heretofore such comments as have appeared in the press have contained admissions that much may be said in favor of the reform, some even acknowledging that the arguments urged in support of it are unanswerable. The "Union Printer" is the first journal to offer opposition to these arguments. Since it is an organ of the typographical art, it may be supposed to make out the best case possible. The following extract, which embodies its criticism, may be taken, then, as an illustration of the weakness of the opposition to the new idea.

> The principal objection to this innovation is that it does not accomplish any good purpose, and, as a consequence, is a non-beneficial change. . . . The argument that a compositor could set twenty-five per cent. more type in a day under the new system than under the old one is nonsense. This argument is based on the fact that ordinary poetry is much "phatter" than prose; but it seems not to be taken into consideration that prose set without spacing the line between the words would not have the turn-over lines and extra short lines which make poetry "phat." There would not be a half-dozen lines in a column of solid nonpareil where over a three-em quad would be used in justifying the line, and many lines would come out almost even,—or say within one em of the end of the line; so there would not be such a wonderful saving after all, surely not enough to compensate for the horrible appearance of a paper set up that way. . . . The reading public will not submit tamely to a charge of this kind, and, as long as space in newspapers is as valuable as it is now, they are not going to take kindly to it.

It is hardly worth while to discuss with the "Union Printer" the merits of the two methods of typography from the æsthetic point of view. The extent and depth of that journal's interest in art are best measured by the standard that obtains in its own office. As a typographical journal it ought to be a typographical model. Nevertheless I am willing to submit Liberty for comparison with the "Union Printer" to a committee of three experts chosen by any reasonable method, who shall decide which of the two papers presents the less "horrible appearance."

I have had numerous testimonials from highly cultivated persons favoring the reform for purely æsthetic reasons. One gentleman, himself a prominent author, likes the new typography because it presents a more Gothic appearance than the old; and the uneven edge is being more and more employed in title-pages and in the artistic posters now so much in vogue. Some readers who did not like the change at first now declare themselves more than reconciled to it, while not one of those who claim that the uneven edge is offensive to the eye has ever been able to deny that it appears on every page of the most beautiful books of poetry as well as on many pages of prose works containing dialogue, and that there it never in the least offended them. The only answer that I have ever been able to elicit from such a person is the exclamation: "Oh, that's different!" So far as I have been able to analyze the opposition of those to whom the uneven edge is offensive, it is dictated by mere habit rather than by real capacity of artistic discrimination.

Turning now to the "Union Printer's" attempted refutation of the economic reasons for adopting the reform, I find that journal displaying an ignorance of its own craft of which it ought to be ashamed. It assumes that the amount saved by the new method is proportional, in any given line, to the amount of blank space left at the end of the line before "justification." There is hardly a "devil" in New York capable of such a blunder. The labor of "justification" in *good* work depends, not upon the amount of blank space at the end of the line, but upon the ease or difficulty with which that space can be equally distributed between the words contained in the line. Take, for instance, a line containing seven words: if the blank space at the end of the line is equal only to a one-em quad, accurate "justification" can be had only by taking out the six three-em spaces between the words and substituting for each an en quad, which involves the handling of twelve pieces of metal; if, on the other hand, the space at the end of the line is twice as great, or equal to a two-em quad, equally accurate "justification" can be had by inserting one three-em space after each word except the last, which involves the handling of only six pieces of metal. The fact is that the labor of "justification" is determined, not by the amount of space at the end of the line, but by the ratio of that amount of space to the number of words in the line. Therefore the argument of the "Union Printer" that the saving would be insignificant because the space at the end of the line averages not much more than an em is not only a fallacy, but, when used by a printer, inexcusable and ludicrous nonsense.

Equally erroneous is the "Union Printer's" assumption that the calculation of saving is arrived at by taking it for granted that prose set by the new method is as "phat" as poetry. Neither in Liberty, or in the newspaper article upon which the "Union Printer's" editorial is a comment, has poetry been taken into consideration in considering the economic advantages of the innovation. The amount to be saved has been demonstrated in actual practice. Eighteen months' experience with the new method in this office has shown that a compositor can set, correct, and distribute seven thousand ems by the new method in the time which he requires in order to set, correct, and distribute five thousand ems by the old method at fine book-work,—a gain not simply of twenty-five per cent. (I do not know where the "Union Printer" found that figure), but of forty per cent. Of course, the gain of the new method over the old would not be so great in work of a lower standard, but even in the most careless daily newspaper office it would certainly be ten per cent.,—perhaps fifteen. Does the "Union Printer" mean to say that an innovation making a gain of even ten per cent. would not thereby "accomplish any good purpose"?

The idea that the new method wastes space is another absurdity. Space is wasted only in those lines which under the old method would be "justified" by spacing narrower than the normal. These are very few in number, and in a large majority even of these cases the waste is offset at the end of the paragraph, the unfilled last line of which will generally accommodate the words thus driven over. Calculation shows the actual waste of space to be not more than one per cent., which even the most valuable newspaper would not consider for a moment in comparison with a saving of ten per cent. in its composition bill.

The only obstacle to the introduction of the new method is the hostility of the public to innovation, and this will disappear when the strangeness has worn away. If I ever resume the business of publishing books calculated for popular sale, those who read them will become accustomed to the new method of typography, and as a result others will be able to adopt it. Short-sighted printers and their organs will oppose it in vain, as they have opposed other labor-saving devices; they may hinder it for a time, but they cannot prevent its ultimate success.

T.

Why the Tories Triumphed?

Accounting for the sweeping victory of the Conservatives in the late British elections, Mr. Balfour finds the real cause of the anti-Liberal revolt in the essential "conservatism" of the English people. "We are, and we have always been," he says, "throughout the long and glorious growth of our constitutional liberties a conservative people." If England has always been conservative, how does she happen to possess more real freedom than any other country in the world? France, I presume, would be regarded by Mr. Balfour as essentially a revolutionary and unstable country, yet France enjoys less freedom than England. A people that is always conservative never advances beyond its first stage, for it dreads change and experiment. But Mr. Balfour goes on to explain that the conservatism of the English is not of the unreasoning kind, and that it opposes only "stupid revolutionary projects, ill considered, forced by no national necessity, required by no social growth, not called for by any real pressing need of the time." Does Mr. Balfour know of any country which deliberately welcomes such projects? He implies that the English Liberals, who, by the way, constitute one-half of the conservative English people, favor revolutionary

change for its own sake, which of course is nonsense. The projects which Mr. Balfour's party does not like are naturally denounced by it as stupid and gratuitous, but they do not so appear to those who advocate them. As soon as the Tories discern political advantage in a project, they eagerly embrace it, and it then becomes safe and conservative. Irish home rule is revolutionary when proposed by Gladstone, and perfectly prudent when Tory politicians are obliged to concede it. Labor measures are senseless coming from Liberals, but old-age pensions, government housing of the poor, and arbitration are eminently moderate when advanced by Mr. Chamberlain. The real reason why the Liberals were turned down so unceremoniously is that their performances fell far below their professions and promises. The people expected impossibilities from them, and became angry when they did not get them. The Tories will undergo an exactly similar experience. They will be tried, found wanting, and repudiated in their turn. Government is a failure, but the people have not as yet discovered it. They blame the party in power for everything that is out of joint and unsatisfactory, and, as things are bound to go wrong, no party can feel at home and secure in office.

V. Y.

Law and Facts.

Among the reforms favored by lawyers who are disgusted with the present system of trial by jury there is one which must appear very rational indeed to those who share the dominant notion of the proper province of the jury. The jury, we are told, must simply find what the facts are, while the law they must take from the judge, and they are also bound to accept his view of the application of the law to the facts of the given case. It is clear, however, that the present system does not fully carry out this view. While the jury does less than the original system devolved upon it, it does more than the present idea of a jury's function really implies. In rendering its verdict of guilty or innocent, for the plaintiff or for the defendant, the jury not only finds what the facts are, but applies the law to them and draws the conclusion—the verdict—from the premises—the facts and legal rules. The jury, in other words, virtually says: "We find the facts to be thus and so; the law, we are told, is this and that; hence we reason that the individual on trial has, by doing certain things, violated the law." But, if the jury is simply to judge of the facts, why should it be allowed to proceed, after finding what the facts are, to reason from them in the light of the law? Here the inconsistency appears, and the suggestion above alluded to as natural or rational is that the jury should, instead of passing upon the guilt or innocence of the accused, merely have certain interrogatories submitted to it comprising the facts at issue, and that the answers should consist of plain statements as to the existence or non-existence of certain situations.

To illustrate the difference, let us take a case of assault. One man complains that another has assaulted him, and the plea of the defendant is self-defence. Now, under the present system the jury, after hearing the evidence and the judge's legal instructions, would render a verdict of "guilty" or "not guilty." Under the proposed system, the disputed facts would be summarized and submitted to the jury in the shape of interrogatories, and the answers would be: "We find that plaintiff was attacked, etc., by defendant under such-and-such circumstances, and that no facts showing self-defence were established," or the reverse. The court, then, would apply the law to the facts as found, and pronounce the verdict.

Such a scheme would really and fully carry out the idea of separating facts from law and confining the jury strictly to the former. Those who believe in the separation can offer no substantial objection to the proposal, and hence it is likely that it may eventually be adopted.

But would such a trial in any true sense correspond to the original idea of trial by jury? Does not the bare statement of the scheme disclose its illegitimate character from the proper point of view? Indeed, it is difficult to see why, having gone so far, the reformers are not courageous enough to advocate the abolition of the jury system altogether. What special value is there in a jury's analysis of the facts? Are twelve ordinary, untrained men more fit to sift out facts from an unclassified mass of conflicting, inaccurate testimony than an educated, experienced judge? On the contrary, the judge is obviously far more competent to separate the facts from the unreliable rubbish of half-forgotten, half-imagined accounts given by witnesses. Nor are judges more apt to be biassed than jurors in analysis of testimony. There is really no reason for objecting to the determination of the facts by the judges, and a very plausible argument might be made in favor of reversing the present arrangement and making juries judges of the law and courts judges of the facts. This plan would work far better than the one now prevailing, for the judge's analysis would serve only to guide the jury to just conclusions, and it would be at perfect liberty to disregard it in the verdict. At all events our present system is the most illogical of all that can be imagined, and its days are numbered. We shall probably have to try something that is even more remote (though, perhaps, more consistent in itself) from genuine trial by jury before there is a reversion to the true ideal of a court of common sense and conscience,—of a jury that has nothing imposed on it, and that is empowered to do justice regardless of cast-iron rules and fixed statutes.

V. Y.

Paper Money and Security.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I do not wish to use space in your columns to the exclusion of those who are capable of affording greater profit to the readers of the paper, nor do I particularly desire or expect to have the last word in the argument; but I do love a friendly wrangle, and would therefore again crave opportunity for a few words in reply to your criticism in No. 317, styled "The Main Point First, Please."

I never dodge anything except physical manifestations of force in an argument, and, if the use of italics in connection with the words, "He ignores it altogether," was intended to imply that I had done so, I disclaim any intention of so doing. You claim that I did not hit the main point; you admit that I hit what I shot at, and agree with it, but say that it has nothing to do with the case, because I directed my aim towards the wrong target. In my article in No. 313 I said that the efficiency of paper promises to pay money depended upon their being immediately redeemable in that medium which in the highest degree possesses all the essential attributes of real money. You say that that feature is of no consequence,—that people will as readily, or more readily, accept an adequately-secured promise to pay at a time specified than an inadequately-secured promise to pay on demand. You say: "In this lies the essence of my criticism." A little further along you say that it is incumbent upon me to "prove that it is possible, otherwise than by maintaining a dollar for dollar coin reserve, to have a paper currency, professedly redeemable on demand, which will surely hold the public confidence in the face of evidence that coin is being cornered." I will give a little evidence before going farther. During the year 1857 the Suffolk Bank of Boston, under what was called the "Suffolk System," redeemed $400,000,000 of unsecured promises to pay money on demand, and no bill of any bank belonging to that system was ever discredited.* The paper promises to pay of those banks remained in circulation until August 1, 1866, when they were driven out of circulation by the arbitrary imposition by act of congress of the ten per cent. tax on the note circulation of State banks, which went into effect upon that date, and which was intended to force all banks to become national banks. The Scotch banking system affords another illustration extending over a period of more than two hundred years, during which time, under a system of free banking, no bill of issue has ever been discredited.†

I have no means of knowing how much coin the Suffolk bank kept on hand during 1857, but it is not probable that it ever had at any one time more than $5,000,000. Now about coin being "cornered." It is possible to corner any commodity, anywhere, at any time, only because somebody, or a number of somebodies, have agreed to deliver certain quantities of that commodity at a specified time; that is, they have indicated that they must have at a certain time a stated quantity of a named commodity, and, by limiting themselves as to time, they have given opportunity and incentive to lock up the named commodity, thereby, to their own discomfiture, creating a corner. Would not there be greater opportunity for a corner in coin with the knowledge that a given known amount must be available at a certain date, or would it be better to leave it to the option of the holder of the promise to pay to elect when the demand for redemption should be made? Now as to a paper money based upon "adequate security." I am at a loss to know of what the security would consist; adequate security must be something that would be stable and instantly convertible into that medium possessing all the attributes of money; there is but one commodity of that character at present, and that is gold. You evidently have something else in mind as security, for your proposition is to "ultimately" redeem the "adequately-secured" paper promise in real money. Another thing: whenever paper money is made secure, the cost of the security will always equal or exceed the nominal face value on the note secured. This must be so, else the security will not be what it is intended. Security cannot be had without cost; it must be fully paid for. The use of paper money is prompted by the motive of economy, and, whenever its cost is increased by making it secure, the reason for its use is destroyed; the ease with which it can be handled is not alone sufficient justification for its existence. Paper money, to be most efficient, must rest solely on the intelligence and integrity of the author of its existence; therefore its range of circulation cannot be extended beyond the field in which it is known and where its great usefulness is due to the sustaining power of a confidence that is born of personal knowledge of the financial standing and integrity of the source of its existence.

Paper money is purely a credit, and must therefore stay with those who are acquainted with its origin and character; it must stay near its father, so that he can ever protect its good name. All attempts towards giving it status so that it may become nomadic, roaming over a wide field, and accepted at the purported face value, will be so expensive as to make the use of paper money in the place of coin not worth while. Paper money must be sustained by confidence. Confidence cannot be created; it must grow; and it can

* Statement of William Dodsworth, before committee on banking, house of representatives, Dec. 13, 1894.

† Herbert Spencer, "Social Statics."

only grow with opportunity. With demand notes the opportunity to test the ability of their author to redeem them will come frequently, because the holder is free to demand payment whenever he elects to do so. Because those notes have been and are redeemed on demand, there will be a growing and steadily strengthening confidence in their usefulness. With secured promises to pay money at some future time there would be faith in their ultimate redemption, provided the security was regarded as good and sufficient; but faith is not confidence.

There is a very important distinction to be made between faith and confidence. For instance, every one knows any number of people who have faith to believe that there is a divine providence who constantly watches over and guards them, while their every act proves that they have no confidence whatever in the reality of such a power. During our civil war the people had faith to believe in the ultimate redemption of the greenbacks, but, because of an impairment of confidence on account of the failure of the United States to redeem its promises on demand, notwithstanding the faith in the goodness of the security, there was a material depreciation of the greenback as compared with gold.

It seems to me that there is clearly a difference beween faith and confidence, and that therefore paper money, without the immediate redemption quality, will ever fail to inspire and command that confidence which is so necessary to its circulation and usefulness.

A. W. WRIGHT.

In complaining that Mr. Wright ignored the main point of my criticism it was not at all my intention to charge him with evasion, but simply to call the readers' attention to the fact that he had missed the essential point. I have perfect confidence in Mr. Wright's straightforwardness. But even had his failure to consider my main point awakened in me any suspicion of his frankness, his present disclaimer would not have been needed in order to remove it, for I see from other portions of his article that he has not that familiarity with the economics of Anarchism which I supposed him to have at the outset of the discussion, and without which he might easily fail to identify my central argument. It now appears that the possibility of anything else than gold as adequate security for paper money is a conception which his mind never before entertained. When I speak of paper money based upon adequate security and yet not upon gold, he opens wide his eyes and asks: What can you mean? Why, my dear Mr. Wright, the very keystone of Anarchist economics, so far as finance is concerned, is the proposition to extend from gold to all other commodities that right of direct representation in the currency which gold now enjoys exclusively. The prohibition, or ruinous taxation, of money issued directly against miscellaneous securities is the chief denial of freedom of which the banking monopoly is guilty, and the right to so issue money is the chief liberty which freedom in banking will bestow upon us. How this right may be utilized and the tremendous changes that would follow its exercise are things not explained in "Social Statics." To understand them Mr. Wright must lay down his Spencer and pick up Colonel Greene, whose "Mutual Banking," though temporarily out of print, will probably be republished soon. If Mr. Wright will then read it carefully, our discussion will proceed more profitably. Meanwhile I will briefly examine the facts and arguments which he now offers.

For proof of the possibility of a solvent demand currency without a dollar-for-dollar coin reserve he advances the solvency of the Suffolk Bank and the Scotch banks. I answer that the case of the Suffolk Bank must be considered in connection with the history of the whole State banking system then prevailing. That history is one long succession of failures of banks intrinsically solvent but unable to meet sudden demands for gold. During such an experience everything does not fall; something has to stand, and people naturally reserve their confidence for the institution which has the greatest reputation. The Suffolk Bank stood, not because it was solvent while other banks were insolvent, but because the noteholders knew that the men at the back of it were men of great reputation and wealth who could and would supply it with coin in case of need. The illustration is really an unfortunate one for Mr. Wright, since by it he cites an entire banking system in which institution after institution, with assets far exceeding liabilities, were forced to suspend for lack of ready coin.

The solvency of the Scotch banks is due mainly to the following facts: first, that the stockholders in every bank except the three oldest of these institutions are liable to the whole extent of their personal fortunes for the bank's debts; secondly, that Scotch law enables property, both real and personal, to be attached with exceptional ease; third, that every note issued by a bank in excess of its average circulation for the year ending May 1, 1845, must be represented by an equal amount of coin in its coffers; and, fourth, that all new banks of issue have been forbidden since 1845. I do not deny that under such conditions demand notes can hold their solvency without a full coin reserve; but certainly Mr. Wright must withdraw his assertion that free banking prevails in Scotland. It is surely an invasion to prohibit banks run on the plan of limited liability. But, where these are not prohibited and where there is otherwise perfect freedom in banking, there will be no banks on the plan of unlimited liability, for they could get no business. Wealthy men will not jeopardize their entire fortunes without being roundly rewarded in the shape of dividends, and borrowers will not pay four, five, or six per cent. for the notes of an unlimited-liability bank when they can get *adequately-secured* notes from a limited-liability bank for less than one per cent.

It should be added here that, however true the statement may have been when "Social Statics" was written, it is not true now that no Scotch bill has ever been discredited. Two of the largest Scotch banks suspended in 1857, and one of them, the Western Bank, went entirely to pieces; and, if my memory is correct, Scotland has known one or two serious bank failures within the last twenty years.

Mr. Wright is mistaken as to the necessary conditions of a "corner." A commodity may be cornered whether there are any promises to deliver it in existence or not. It can be cornered to induce a scarcity and consequent rise in price. Now, this rise in price would surely be much greater, and therefore also the incentive to create a corner, if the corner would give rise to a panic and thus cause a tremendous artificial demand. And it is precisely this that happens when gold is cornered and demand notes are in circulation. There is just as much incentive for the speculator when he knows that he can frighten people into calling for ten millions on a certain day as when he knows that some one has promised to pay ten millions on a certain day. Furthermore, the incentive in the former case would be very much greater than in the latter if the obligation to pay the ten millions were in the latter case contingent upon the happening of a very improbable thing. Now with mutual banking such would be the case. If the banks of New York held notes of borrowers to the amount of a million dollars and all maturing on the same day, and if the million dollars (or slightly less) which the banks had issued in their own notes to these borrowers were redeemable in gold at a later day if not presented on the earlier day for redemption by a re-exchange of notes, the borrowers, by turning in the bank-notes in fulfilment of their own obligations to the banks, would wipe out the banks' indebtedness of a million, with the exception of perhaps two or three thousand dollars, the percentage of bad debts being very small. Thus gold would be needed only to settle this trivial balance, and so slight a demand would furnish very little incentive for a corner.

I have now examined all the evidence adduced by Mr. Wright to show that demand notes can surely stand against a run (the only question that I am now discussing with him), and I claim, on the strength of this examination, that the evidence leads to precisely the opposite conclusion.

T.

Conspirators, Not Enemies.

The article on "Government and Christian Missions" which Mr. Byington contributes to this issue of Liberty is novel and interesting; moreover, it is valuable from an Anarchistic standpoint in that it holds up fresh illustrations of government invasiveness. But I do not think that the facts and the argument bear out Mr. Byington's conclusion that Church and State are hostile. It will be found, I believe, that, in nearly every case of persecution of missionaries by government, either the persecuting State has more nearly at heart the interests of some other sect or church than that which the persecuted mission represents, or that there is some local jealousy prompting a struggle between the State officials and the missionaries for the upper hand. Undoubtedly there are exceptions to this rule, but exceptional cases will not suffice to establish the existence of deep-rooted incompatibility between Church and State.

To be sure, there is a certain superficial hostility between these two institutions; that fact nobody disputes. So husband and wife may fight like cats and dogs, but, the moment it becomes necessary to safeguard their interests against the encroachments of the family living the other side of the fence, there will be perfect harmony between them. So, too, thieves are always quarreling among themselves, but they will lie for each other, and sometimes die for each other, at the last. Church and State are hostile just as party factions are hostile and just as parties themselves are hostile, but not otherwise. Tammany Democrats and Grace Democrats war for the spoils until the Democratic party is in danger; then you find them shoulder to shoulder. Democrats and Republicans combat for the control of the country until a third party becomes formidable enough

to endanger Wall street; then they make common cause. And similarly Church and State have their jealousies and bickerings and conflicts until Atheism and Anarchism unite in the same persons in order to emancipate the masses from mental and physical exploitation; then they become a solid phalanx arrayed against the "enemies of law and order and religion."

Both Church and State are the tools of privileged capital. The altar, the crown, and the cash-box, these three, but the greatest of these is the cash-box. The altar, which once was first in the hierarchy, has of late years become last. Its function in the conspiracy has become that of teaching the people to replenish the cash-box and obey the crown. Now, as the crown has taken precedence of the altar, the altar sometimes suffers at its hands; hence such facts as Mr. Byington cites. But altar and crown will not fail to unite to do the bidding of the cash-box, upon which they subsist and whose interests they subserve. The harmony of these powers is not to be disturbed by however long an array of cases where kings have killed or crippled priests of another nation or another sect. T.

The editor of the London "Spectator," in an article on Huxley, pertinently observes that it was inconsistent and incongruous for the great agnostic to affirm, as he did, that Jesus was "a moral genius," the greatest moral reformer that the human race has produced. The truth of this criticism is undeniable. There is nothing to support the assertion, and it is regrettable that Huxley weakly conceded such an unfounded claim, generally made by those who cannot stomach the superstitions about Jesus and who try to escape censure by professing to discover *something* extraordinary and wonderful in him. Jesus's teachings, as we know them, are full of contradictions and totally impracticable precepts. What sort of moral genius is he whose guidance would be fatal to all society and progress and whom the most intense admirers never dream of imitating? The Christian cant about Jesus is sickening enough, and strong, sane men ought not to give it what the common law calls "color" by acquiescence or endorsement. It is to Spencer's credit that he has never deemed it worth while to throw any sops to Christianity. On the contrary, he has pointedly challenged all its claims to moral genius and a monopoly of virtue.

There seems to be no doubt that the University of Chicago, which was built and is maintained chiefly by the wealth of oil magnates and other monopolists, has dropped Professor Bemis for no other reason than his heresies on the question of "natural monopolies," trusts, silver, and other questions in which plutocracy is vitally interested. The outcry in the shallow press against this action is irrational, however, for, whether one agrees with Bemis or not, he must admit that people cannot be expected to support an institution which holds them up to scorn and instructs its students to make war upon them. Those who pay the bills will naturally dictate the policy. If Professor Bemis were an abler and more prominent man, it might have been impossible to get rid of him, but, as he is obscure and insignificant, no ceremony or explanations were deemed necessary.

The Rent of the Politician's Ability.

[J. H. Levy in Personal Rights.]

The economics of the London county council—notwithstanding the presence on that body of Mr. Sidney Webb—appears to be in the *sic volo* stage. The self-styled Progressives seem to be under the impression that all that is necessary in order to attain a given economic end is that they should declare with sufficient emphasis: "Thus shall it be." Well, they have had an object lesson to the contrary; and object lessons are very useful where the reasoning powers are in an undeveloped condition. With persons of a certain order of intelligence it is necessary that their heads should come violently into collision with a brick wall before they will recognize its existence.

The London county council, like many other governing bodies, has been suffering of late from an acute attack of vicarious philanthropy. A notion seems to have got abroad in "advanced" circles that the most excellent form of generosity is that in which Smith gives to Brown what he holds in trust for Jones and Robinson, or forces Jones and Robinson themselves to make the gift. In this way Smith gets all the merit of doing a virtuous deed, and Brown the advantage of an increase of his worldly goods, without any of those onerous conditions which are usually attached to such transactions.

The London county council has endeavored to earn much merit in this way, its latest exploit being a most noteworthy one of the kind. It has purchased some of the lines of the London Street Tramways Co., and has leased the lines to the company which it compelled to sell them. As the parliamentary mandate from which the council derives its powers has been drawn up with the grossest looseness, and as a majority of its members have constituted themselves knights-errant of "labor," it has indulged in all sorts of freaks of the Protectionist and Socialistic kind, with the general idea that whatever restrains and worries "capital" must turn to the advantage of those to whom it gives employment. It, therefore, inserted in its lease to the London Street Tramways Co. a stipulation that its employees should work only ten hours per day, instead of eleven hours and a quarter as heretofore.

The idea evidently was that the cost of this diminution of the hours of labor—in itself most desirable—should be paid out of the dividend of the company. We do not mean that Mr. Sidney Webb indulged in this illusion. He is a thoroughgoing Communist, willing and anxious to "socialize" all the means of production, distribution, and exchange—including personal ability; and he would not have the smallest objection to the county council placing the cost of the one hour and a quarter for the tramcar men on the rates of the metropolis, or of making use of the economic ignorance of his colleagues to attain this end. We, therefore, do not address ourselves to him. Our quarrel with him lies on ethical and political, rather than on economic, ground. But his colleagues have shown, by their subsequent action, that they have no overt intention to make a present to the tramcar men of £10,000 per annum out of the rates.

Now, if these gentlemen had taken the trouble to think out the question, or had got some competent economist to do it for them, they would have found out that to make the London Street Tramways Co. pay the cost of this reduction of hours was an economic impossibility; that, if they forced it on the company, the cost must come out of the funds controlled by the council. When the lease was duly executed, the company called its employees together, and frankly asked them whether they thought the company could afford to pay them as much for ten hours' labor as they had been paid up to then for eleven hours and a quarter. The men at once confessed that they could not expect this, and that they preferred the longer hours with the old pay.

This reply is in itself sufficient to show the unwisdom of the busybodies who interfered in their behalf. The truth is that, in a free market, if men who do light work in comparatively pleasant circumstances wish to obtain something like the same daily wage as is earned by intenser labor under less pleasant circumstances, they must pay for this in the longer duration of their day's labor. Eleven hours and a quarter is a long day's work; but, estimated in wear and tear, it may be no worse than nine hours or eight hours of other work. At all events, the only safe way of dealing with these matters is by the method of freedom. Leisure may be a blessing to a man; but it may also be a curse. All depends on his ability to use it wisely or unwisely; and it is far more likely to be used wisely when it comes as a result of his own effort and choice than when it is thrust on him from outside by even the most benevolent agency.

As the tramcar men preferred the longer hours with the higher pay, they went to the county council and told them so; and the county council invited the company "to negotiate with them for any fair readjustment of the rent to secure the intended reduction of hours without reducing the wages." But as the rent agreed upon was £5,729 per annum, and the cost of the reduced hours was estimated at £10,000, and the directors of the company very properly considered *ultra vires* any giving away of their shareholders' money for philanthropic purposes, the proposed "readjustment" of the agreement would have required that the county council, instead of receiving a rental of £5,729, should pay to the company a yearly subvention of £4,271.

This was plainly put before the county council by the solicitors to the company, who also required that, before the "readjustment" was agreed to by the company, the county council should guarantee their legal ability to "apply the ratepayers' money for the purposes proposed, whether by a direct payment or by reduction of rent." The matter was thus brought before the council in a manner which even they could understand; and they withdrew their stipulation for shorter hours for the men. The company readily agreed to another stipulation,—that the wages of the men should not be decreased nor their hours increased; and the county council, having thus made a feeble attempt to save their dignity in the process of climbing down, by forcing an open door, proceeded to other business.

There is one point, however, left, and that a most important one. The notion seems still to be harbored in some quarters that the county council failed to saddle the company with the cost of the reduction of hours, by omitting to stipulate in the lease that the wages of the men should not be reduced. The "Westminster Gazette" hints as much. It may, therefore, be worth while to show that in no case could the company have been made to bear the cost of the reduction of the men's hours of labor, when forced on them by the county council.

Either the £5,729 which the company has agreed to pay as rent is the most they could afford to pay, and therefore the most they would pay, or it is not. If it *is* the most they would pay, then it is quite clear that it is futile to attempt to force upon them, in addition to this, a working arrangement by which they would lose £10,000 per annum. But if, on the other hand, the £5,729 is not the most they would have paid rather than forego the use of the line; if they would have paid the £5,729 and have agreed also to a changed method of working the line by which they would lose £10,000,—then it is quite clear that they would have paid £15,729 as rent, if they had not been called upon to make this sacrifice of £10,000. *This means that the loss caused by the reduction of hours would have fallen on the rent of the line;* and that, if this loss is still incurred without any gain to the tramcar men, it can only be because the county council has let a line worth £15,729 per annum for £5,729, or—to put the matter in technical phrase which Mr. Sidney Webb will be able to explain to his colleagues—the £10,000 stands in the account of the London ratepayers as negative "rent of ability" of their county council.

A Way to Interest the Average Man.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Please find enclosed ten cents, and send one hundred propaganda slips.

Our comrade Gordak has cleverly demonstrated that it is possible to prepare progressive mental food for the average man,—the one we need, and who may thus be reached.

Your idea is a good one; the slip may be enclosed in almost every letter mailed by the friends of Liberty: thus we should flood the land with our literature, and our aims and principles would be sufficiently understood to defeat their misrepresentation.

Truly yours, JAMES THIERRY.

OTTER LAKE, MICH., Aug. 17, 1895.

Governments and Christian Missions.

It is sometimes said that civilized nations live under government, while savage tribes live in Anarchy, and that a comparison between civilized and savage life is a comparison between government and the Anarchist ideal. Now, certainly, no one who knows what Anarchism is, and who has carefully read the best accounts of savage tribes, will admit that they are generally more Anarchistic than we. Some of them are, and their people are usually reported to be happy and peaceful; but in most cases it is quite the opposite. And this in itself is a sufficient answer to the assertion I have cited.

But when we are asked to approve the subjugation of savage or half-civilized peoples by those who call themselves civilized, and the reason given us is that the civilized government will help to civilize the natives and cure them of their savage vices, then it becomes appropriate for Anarchistic students to examine more closely the evidence for this alleged utility of civilized government. This I propose to do by the help of the testimony of Christian missionaries, who live among the facts they report, and certainly can have no obvious bias against Christian governments.

Although, as I say, there can be no presumption of bias here, there is a prejudice against missionaries and their testimony, so widely spread and so strong that I think it necessary to spend a paragraph in warning it off. I cannot here treat in detail the evidence regarding the character of missionaries, their work and their reports, as I could do, with satisfaction to myself, if space allowed. I can only point out the obvious general facts that missions are supported mainly by those who believe the missionary's life to be one of extreme self-sacrifice; that the missionary ranks are mainly recruited from this class, therefore from those whose temperament leads them, for conscience's and religion's sake, to face what they, at the time of volunteering, believe to be such a life of self-sacrifice; and that, this being their usual character when they start, it is ridiculous to assume that, on reaching their chosen field of labor, the bulk of them become liars, cheats, idlers, and luxury-seekers. Yet this is what we are asked to believe when we are told that the missionary's life is one of unearned luxury, and that his reports to the home constituency are falsified for the purpose of keeping up salaries.

The fact is that these stories about missionaries are parallel with the assertions that prominent Anarchists and other labor agitators are carrying on their work as the laziest way of getting a good income. Both classes of reports are started by prejudice,—many times by personal malice,—and accepted and propagated by ignorance. There are "black sheep in every flock," but such are scattered individuals among a great body who are straightforwardly working to improve the condition of humanity in what they understand to be the best way.

I shall, therefore, accept missionary reports as reliable testimony, as Darwin did after he had once personally examined the missionaries' work; and I shall examine especially the work of the Congregational societies, with which I, as a Congregationalist, am familiar.

The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions has missions in Hawaii, Micronesia, Japan, China, India and Ceylon, Natal, Central Africa, Turkey, Bulgaria, Austria, Spain, and Mexico. Those in Japan, China, and Central Africa are under heathen governments, with which the missionaries get along well; the Central African ones were once banished by the intrigue of a Portuguese trader, but soon recalled. The other heathen government, Turkey, is as objectionable to the missionaries as to everybody else. The "unspeakable Turk" needs no comment here, beyond saying that his government deserves its reputation.

Of the nominally Christian countries to which missions are sent as to heathen, no special complaint is made of the governments in Bulgaria (Greek Church) and Mexico. The latter country has a law against the public processions of the Catholic Church. The Congregational missionaries do not generally approve the law, I think, but protest against its non-enforcement on the ground that, where laws exist, they should be respected. The Austrian government is almost as much of a plague to the missionaries as its neighbor, the Turk. Both have nominal religious liberty, but both follow the same policy of refusing permission to have buildings for missionary purposes, laying unreasonable restrictions on preaching and teaching, and allowing persecution of converts by irresponsible local officials. There is some of the same business in Spain, but not so much.

The Hawaiian missionaries approve of the newly-established government there.

I do not remember that the missionaries in Natal say anything particular for or against the British government there. I suppose they like it. Their schools are helped by government grants-in-aid, as in India and all British possessions.

In India the missionaries all endorse the government, but continually grumble at its shortcomings. It may almost be said that their usual attitude is one of approving the British government's existence, but condemning its actions. The main reason given for approving its existence is that, if the natives were not held in check, the Mohammedans and Hindus would cut each other's throats, while the native Christians, too few to defend themselves, would get a double share of kicks from both sides, and the foreigners would be massacred. The government's work in giving the natives European education is also applauded, though there is some complaint that the "godless" education of the government colleges spreads infidelity. In the government's past record the missionaries approve the general good order maintained, and in particular the suppression of religious murders, like thuggee and the sacrifice of children to the Ganges, and of religious suicides, like suttee and the old ceremonies of Juggernaut.

As to the dark side of the picture, the East India Company was notoriously hostile to missions as long as it lived and ruled. At first it absolutely prohibited them from entering the country, and, after they were admitted, it hindered them in various ways. It especially scandalized them by taking an official part in the carrying on of the worship of idol temples. (All will agree that here it showed a sad lack of care for the rational education of the people.) Some have declared that the Sepoy rebellion of 1857 was God's judgment on the Company for its enmity to missions; and, in Dr. Pierson's list of the great blessings God sent to the missionary cause in the year 1858, the death of the East India Company had a prominent place. So ended one government of a Christian power over heathens.

The British government in India since then has been avowedly friendly to missions, but has been very slow to square its law-making by missionaries' consciences. It is only within a few years that the missionaries, backed by the World's W. C. T. U., have been able to secure the abolition of the system of State licensure and regulation of prostitution. It is still more lately that they have obtained the prohibition of child-marriage. Yet this prohibition comes quite within Lillian Harman's idea of a proper age-of-consent law, for these marriages used to take place long before the time of puberty even in that precocious race. Little girls were sometimes brought into mission hospitals with their bodies torn apart on the morning after being married to men of fifty, and doubtless it was only a small minority of such cases that ever saw the hospital. But it was all in wedlock, and according to law, under a Christian government. Of course, the girl's willingness or unwillingness made very little difference either with the ceremony or with the consummation of the marriage.

As to opium for home consumption and for export to China, its production is not merely permitted, but carried on by the State as a government monopoly; and the missionaries' grievance over this catering to vice is intensified by the recollection of the famous "opium war" to keep the market open. This war was, to be sure, Anarchistic in one aspect, as it was a free-trade measure, to restrain the Chinese Emperor from prohibiting the trade in opium; nevertheless, it belongs here as showing how Christian governments regard morality in their dealings with the heathen. And even Anarchists will agree that it was poor taste for England to bombard China into admitting a trade that English sentiment condemned.

But the Micronesian mission is in some respects the most instructive of the lot, as it shows the largest number of Christian nations governing the most uncivilized savages of all. This mission works in the Caroline, Marshall, and Gilbert islands, and had been very prosperous as long as the islands were independent. I do not remember that any of our missionaries here were ever used as an addition to the food supply, though some of the islanders had borne a very bad reputation. Often a chief would refuse to let missionaries land, but it was easy to go on to the next island.

Within a few years these three archipelagoes were respectively grabbed by Spain, Germany, and Britain. The missionaries were terrified at hearing that Spain claimed the Caroline group, which contains the island of Ponape, then the headquarters of the mission. They expected nothing but evil from the establishment of this Christian government. In due time the Spanish forces of occupation came, and Ponape was made their capital. Catholic priests came with the soldiers to set up a counter mission, and in a short time a monopoly was established by banishing the Protestant missionaries and destroying their buildings. As the natives were attached to the old missionaries, this made the Spanish government unpopular. By various measures they so improved their unpopularity (having sent away those whose influence with the natives would have preserved peace) that soon a native rebellion broke out. The Spanish were so well thrashed that for some time they dared not show their heads outside their own settlement. There is peace now; if I understand the situation rightly, Spanish authority is nominally recognized, but the Spaniards find it prudent not to exercise their authority so as to rouse the native temper again. The missionaries, however, are not yet allowed to return to that island, and have had to make Kusaie, another of the Carolines, their centre of operations. They get letters from their Ponape converts, saying that they keep up the work of preaching and teaching their fellow-natives to read, and whatever else they learned in the mission schools, but they are much hampered by their leaders' absence. So much for Catholic white government in Micronesia.

When Spain and Germany were quarrelling over one of the Carolines, the missionaries wished Germany success; but, when they heard that the Germans were coming to occupy the Marshall islands, the consternation was almost as great as the news of the Spanish invasion. The German official on mission fields has the reputation of being harsh and impracticable in his dealings with the natives, and hostile to all forms of religion. Since the German occupation became an accomplished fact, the missionaries have been hampered by needless and annoying regulations; permissions have been refused to send teachers to islands where the natives wished them; and the German officials are said to have been spreading vice among the people. Some months ago Liberty published among the "Beauties of Government" a clipping from the "Missionary Herald," in which Jaluij, the commissioner's capital, is described as "one of Satan's favorite seats." So much for irreligious white government in Micronesia.

The missionaries welcomed the British occupation of the Gilbert islands, partly, perhaps, because they preferred British to native rule, but mainly, I think, because they felt that otherwise Spain, Germany, or France would take possession, and, where independence was impossible, the British were far the best masters. If the choice had been merely between the British and the native chiefs, there would have been less rejoicing. However, the British were welcomed, and have begun their government in the manner shown by the following clipping from the "Missionary Herald," for June, 1895:

Heathen dancing means a great deal to our work, for it includes all the other evils. It means first the taking of all the children out of school to be taught dancing by night and to sleep during the daytime. When dancing, the natives always make their native drinks and are soon intoxicated, when all manner of sins and wickedness follow, with a general demoralizing of the people; and only the firmly established Christians are able to withstand its influence. Thus the work of the schools and teachers is nearly destroyed, and many who were seemingly ready for the harvest are lost. We were sadly disappointed to find this state of affairs following so closely upon the establishment of law and order and schools under the English Protectorate, especially so when there proved to be the same state of affairs throughout the group, with the exception of one island, Malang. At first we

were at [illegible] to account for it, but we soon discovered that the [illegible] commissioner was himself to blame for the [illegible] condition. While he had given the is[illegible] the main an excellent set of laws, he had made the serious blunder of attempting to regulate without altogether prohibiting the practice of dancing. He had told them they might dance on New Year's day, the queen's birthday, and a few such holidays, but at no other times. Mr. Walkup had expostulated with him, but he had replied that this had been the custom in the Fiji Islands and had worked well, and he did not like to take away all of what he called the people's pleasures and games. As soon as the commissioner had left, the natives interpreted the restrictions to suit themselves. The liberty to dance on certain days they took to be a general license for dancing, thinking, no doubt, if it was right to dance on the queen's birthday, it was surely right to dance on their own. The result was that, for three months since the commissioner had left until we came, they had been dancing almost incessantly day and night, only stopping to take food and rest, with the results described.

The missionaries expect that this will be reformed, and that British rule will yet prove a good thing; but up to date it is certainly a fine start for Protestant white government in Micronesia, approved and welcomed by the missionaries!

The United States government has to do with foreign missions only through its diplomatic service. In this respect the missionaries have a standing grievance,—that less care is taken of their interests than of commercial interests in like situations. This comes out especially in countries like Turkey and Micronesia, where there are more American citizens and American dollars in mission work than in trade. The late Armenian massacres have led to the establishment of two new consulates in Turkey; before this the consular service in that country, where there are none but missionaries to protect, and where a great deal of protection is needed, was so scanty as to make it very necessary to have a good minister at Constantinople. There was an uncommonly efficient man there when Harrison was elected; he was, of course, soon replaced by a Republican. I believe the new man turned out well, but the missionaries felt that they had been made to run too much risk for the sake of the glorious spoils system. The chances of failure in that difficult post were so great that, when a successful man was found, he should have been kept. It was at about the same time that the missionaries were turned out of Ponape and their property destroyed. They claimed an indemnity from the Spanish government, but, in spite of Harrison's "vigorous foreign policy" in other cases, the matter was allowed to drag on through the four years of the president's term before a settlement was had. The "Missionary Review of the World" bracketed these two stories in an editorial which almost warned Harrison that he had forfeited the respect of all Christian voters; and in the election of 1892 my father, though favoring Harrison as against Cleveland, added that he did so in spite of Harrison's "cowardly" Ponape record.

But the proper place to look for the missionary record of our government is in home missions. Congregational home missionary work is mainly done through two societies,—the Congregational Home Missionary Society for the whites and the American Missionary Association for the various colored races. The former has not, I believe, had any specially interesting experience with government, either friendly or hostile. The reports of its State superintendents for 1895 have nothing to say about governmental institutions beyond the following three items,—one generalized and qualified commendation with two definite condemnations.

From Utah: "Utah has an excellent public-school law, and the public schools of Salt Lake City are nearly abreast of any in America in equipment, methods, and teachers; but, while the country schools are vastly superior to what they formerly were, they are far from being what they ought to be."

From Nebraska: "Having passed through three very trying seasons in Nebraska,—the grasshopper winter of 1874-5, the winter following the drought of 1890, and the more disastrous one of this past year,—I can testify that the aid which has accomplished the most good in such times is that which goes through the hands of Christian pastors. All State relief has in it the element of public property, to which every one, needy or otherwise, seems to have a sort of right. Christian pastors are in touch with their people and with the communities in which they live; they know who are needy and who are seeking aid while not entitled to it. Many of these latter are ashamed to come and ask the minister for it."

From Wyoming: "The removal of Fort McKinney is a godsend to the place. Any frontier worker at all conversant with Western military posts will recognize in them a 'moral horror.'"

The largest work of the A. M. A. is among the southern negroes, and the greater part of this work is in the line of education. Its colleges occupy the front rank among negro schools. This society, founded by anti-slavery men, has always refused to draw a color-line anywhere in its work. Its schools are always open to black and white alike. Still they are not, in general, practically mixed schools, as neither race chooses to enter a school where the other is found. Only, as the black schools have white teachers, and these teachers often have children, they prefer to keep their children under their own care, and so put them in their classes, —two or three white children among a hundred blacks. This rouses the southern dread of mixed education. Atlanta University was doing this lately, and the representatives of southern chivalry in the Georgia legislature produced a bill to punish with fine, imprisonment, or chain-gang anybody who taught white and colored children in the same school. By a desperate fight the friends of the University killed this bill, but another was passed cutting off the State grant of money ($8,000 a year) from any such school.

At Orange Park, Florida, the Association established a school so far superior to anything in the neighborhood that white residents sent their children to it in spite of the presence of the negro children. Thereupon the Florida legislature passed a law (approved May 29, 1895) to fine or imprison any one who teaches whites and blacks together.

Next to the negroes, the chief work of the A. M. A. is among the Sioux Indians. This mission is the sole survivor of a group which once included prosperous missions to the Chickasaw, Osage, Stockbridge, Choctaw, Tuscarora, and Cherokee tribes. These missions, according to the statement of Dr. Beard, the Association's secretary, before the London Missionary Conference, were killed off by the injustice of the United States government to the Indians. Another fine record for civilization, but an old story.

This mission naturally uses the Sioux language a good deal in its schools, which here again are the main part of its work. In Cleveland's first administration an order was issued prohibiting the use of any but the English language in any Indian schools. This meant a total crippling of the work of mission schools of all denominations, which were doing much more than the government schools to civilize the Indians, and an abandonment of all effort to instruct those who would not, or from age or idiosyncrasy could not, learn English enough for school purposes. It even hindered greatly the teaching of English to those who did not already know it. The local agents at first undertook to enforce the order against all mission schools, and the missionaries did not doubt that it was intended as a blow at their work; but they protested vigorously, and it was officially explained (though contrary to the language of the order) that it applied only to schools supported wholly or partly at public expense. Over such schools it is still nominally in force.

These Indian schools used to receive a large part of their income from government grants, amounting to some tens of thousands a year for the A. M. A. work. But the Association lately voted to refuse all such gifts henceforward,—a pretty emphatic testimony to its opinion of the propriety and utility of government aid in such cases.

The A. M. A. also works among the Chinese of California. Its workers agree that the anti-Chinese laws are an outrage, and hinder the missionary work.

Finally, the A. M. A. has lately started a mission in Alaska. It has very few men there as yet, so that the loss of a single man is a serious blow. It lost a man as follows. There is a law, strict in terms, but little regarded in practice, prohibiting the sale of liquor to Indians in Alaska. This young missionary was alone at his station,—I don't know how far from the nearest white man,—when two white traders came up in a vessel loaded with whiskey. As he found them not disposed to respect either the law or his requests, he decided to perform the legal duty of an American citizen by arresting the criminals and taking them before the nearest magistrate. So he gathered some dozen trusty natives, went on board with his party unharmed, surprised and tied the two men, and prepared to run the vessel down a few hundred miles to the abode of law. But one of the men got his hand loose, reached a concealed pistol, and shot the missionary down. The Indians, deprived of their leader, went over the vessel's side in a panic. The two men sailed off with the missionary, who was not dead; but they contrived, by unnecessary cruising, to delay their arrival in port till he had died for lack of medical attendance. Then they reported their story to the authorities, and nothing was done. I read all this in the report of the commissioner of education for Alaska, but have not heard that this report produced any effect at Washington beyond increasing the job of the government printers.

The fact that he was killed in performing a governmental action makes no difference with the responsibility of the national government in the matter. Our government had no business to authorize and encourage him to do a thing, and then sit by and make no protest when it heard that he had been put to a death of torture for obeying its instructions.

Such is a brief review of the civilizing influences of civilized government, as shown in connection with the missions of one prominent denomination. The history of other missions will only strengthen the picture. Just now France is trying to conquer Madagascar under the pretext that she wants to civilize the natives. The missionaries unanimously wish that the French may come out as badly as they did when they last attacked the island of forests and fevers. I speak of Protestant missionaries; others may think differently, according to this extract from a Paris letter to the Philadelphia "Catholic Times":

The times are approaching when our missions will receive substantial support from that European power which, whatever the fault at home, has never failed to protect Catholic interests abroad. It is the fashion to speak of French policy in Madagascar as a check to England. It is nearer the truth to regard it as a check given to British Protestantism.

Well, under the influence of British Protestantism the natives of Madagascar have made most phenomenal progress in civilization, as even French journals now admit. And this has been done without calling in foreign soldiers, even when Queen Ranavalona I. was massacring the converts wherever she could find them. In other words, it has been done without the help of "Christian and civilized government," except so far as the existing native government has become such by the peaceful progress of mission work. The desirability of a check to British Protestantism by French cannon will hardly be obvious to any but Catholics.

Among all the testimonials given by non Christians to the success and utility of Christian missions, probably the one most valued and most often quoted by the friends of missions is Darwin's. And of all Darwin's testimonials the most prominent is that regarding Tierra del Fuego, where he declared, on visiting the island, that the natives were so low by nature that they could never be civilized; but, years later, learning of the success of the South American Missionary Society there, he acknowledged that what seemed to him a miracle had been accomplished. I am dealing with one of the crown jewels of missionary work, therefore, when I quote this from a report of the Fuegian work, delivered at the London Centennial Missionary Conference:

At the present time not only a Christian mission station exists with daily organized services and well attended schools, church, and orphanage, but the wigwam life has given way to substantial dwellings, surrounded by well-cultivated gardens, and illustrates in no little degree the aspect of a thriving Christian community. Looking at their secular condition, the people have been raised as by a miracle in the social scale; and the results in this respect make us tremble for their future, inasmuch as they are living under the Argentine Republic,—the government, recognizing their improved condition, having now made our mission station one of their points for civil and military administration. Whether these highly civilized conditions, as the natural outgrowth of our work, will survive or not, it is difficult to predicate.

This is to my mind the most striking quotation I have had to make. The missionary does not seem to know which way the blow will fall, but is sure that

where the most surprising progress has been made from the lowest barbarism on earth, the coming of the "civilized and Christian government" of Argentina to take control at the centre of this new-born civilization means disaster in one way or another.

I do not see how any one can read missionary literature extensively without finding in it these two facts: *Christianity and government do not mix well. Civilization and government do not mix well.*

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight, and to notify the secretary promptly in case of any failure to write to a target (which it is hoped will not often occur), or in case of temporary or permanent withdrawal from the work of the Corps. All, whether members or not, are asked to lose no opportunity of informing the secretary of suitable targets. Address, STEPHEN T. BYINGTON, 108 W. 13th Street, New York City.

The "Farmers' Voice" has printed three of our letters so far, with one from a reader of Liberty who is not a member of the Corps or an Anarchist, but who took this occasion to support free banking, and to point out that the first step toward it must be the repeal of the prohibitory tax on State bank notes.

This is one use of the Corps,—that, besides our own writing, we draw out the work of others. I noticed another instance of this within a week in looking over a file of the "Bakers' Journal." It had published several letters sent to Comrade Cohen, and an outsider had made this discussion the occasion for a vigorous Anarchistic criticism of "Merrie England."

Target, section A.—Prof. Arthur G. Burgoyne, Verona, Pa., is the chief editorial writer of the "Pittsburg Leader," which was our target some time ago on account of its anti-Anarchistic fiction supplement, "The Red Queen," and published two of our letters. Prof. Burgoyne is said to be a liberal man and a thorough free-trader. Point out the necessity of applying the free trade principle to money, mails, etc., as well as to tariff, and of throwing open all the "functions of government" to free competition. Show the unreasonableness of current opposition to Anarchism.

Section B.—Barrett Eastman, "Tribune" office, Chicago, Ill., is an editorial writer on the Chicago "Tribune," and does not believe in the policy of "making people happy by legislation." Show the artificial character of our whole system of government, or of any of its leading regulations, and the possibility of a better life under free conditions.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

A RARE OPPORTUNITY.

Bound Volumes of Liberty, Almost New.

I have for disposal one volume each of vols. III and IV, and will deliver them to the person offering the largest amount therefor. Figures will be received until September 1, 1895.

WM. TRINKAUS, 322 Rialto Building, Chicago, Ill.

THE BALLOT.

BY WILLIAM WALSTEIN GORDAK.

A short poem illustrating the absurdity of majority rule. Printed as a leaflet, with an effective advertisement of Liberty on the back. Excellent for propagandism.

Ten Cents Per Hundred Copies.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York City.

FRANCIS NOREEN

A PRACTICAL TAILOR CATERING TO THE FASTIDIOVS AND ECCENTRIC AT FORTY-ONE ESSEX STREET BOSTON, MASSACHVSETTS

RIPANS TABULES regulate the stomach, liver and bowels, purify the blood, are safe and effectual. The best general family medicine known for Biliousness, Constipation, Dyspepsia, Foul Breath, Headache, Heartburn, Loss of Appetite, Nausea, Dyspepsia, Painful Digestion, Pimples, Sallow Complexion, Tired Feeling, and every symptom or disease resulting from impure blood, or a failure by the stomach, liver or intestines to perform their proper functions. Two grains taken every evening are beneficial by taking a TABULE after each meal. Price, of druggists or by mail, 60 cents for No. 1 Package (6 boxes) $0.60. Address RIPANS CHEMICAL CO., New York. Samples free.

THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY.

BY

STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS.

A well-printed book of 165 large pages, consisting of two essays bearing the following titles respectively: "The True Constitution of Government in the Sovereignty of the Individual as the Final Development of Protestantism, Democracy, and Socialism"; "Cost the Limit of Price: A Scientific Measure of Honesty in Trade as One of the Fundamental Principles in the Solution of the Social Problem."

This work is an elaborate exposition of the teachings of Josiah Warren by one of his foremost disciples.

PRICE IN CLOTH, $1.00; IN PAPER, 50 CENTS.

PREMIUM OFFER.

Any person purchasing of the undersigned a cloth-bound copy of "The Science of Society" will also receive, free of charge, one copy of "The Review of the Anarchist Case," by Gen. M. M. Trumbull, and of "The Reasons for Pardoning Schwab, *et al.*," by Gov. John P. Altgeld.

Any person purchasing a paper-bound copy will also receive, free of charge, one copy of Tolstoi's "Church and State."

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York City.

MODERN MARRIAGE.

BY ÉMILE ZOLA.

Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker.

In this his latest story Zola takes four typical marriages,—one from the nobility, one from the *bourgeoisie*, one from the petty *bourgeoisie*, and one from the working-people,—and describes, with all the power of his wondrous art, how each originates, by what motive each is inspired, how each is consummated, and how each results.

PRICE, 15 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by the Publisher,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, NEW YORK CITY.

INSTEAD OF A BOOK:

BY A MAN TOO BUSY TO WRITE ONE.

A FRAGMENTARY EXPOSITION OF

PHILOSOPHICAL ANARCHISM.

Culled from the Writings of
BENJ. R. TUCKER,
EDITOR OF LIBERTY.

With a Full-Page Half-Tone Portrait of the Author.

A large, well-printed, and excessively cheap volume of 524 pages, consisting of articles selected from Liberty and classified under the following headings: (1) State Socialism and Anarchism: How Far They Agree, and Wherein They Differ; (2) The Individual, Society, and the State; (3) Money and Interest; (4) Land and Rent; (5) Socialism; (6) Communism; (7) Methods; (8) Miscellaneous. The whole elaborately indexed.

Price, Fifty Cents.

Mailed, post-paid, by the Publisher,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, NEW YORK CITY.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York, N. Y.

THE QUINTESSENCE OF IBSENISM. By G. Bernard Shaw. Pronounced by the London *Saturday Review* a "most diverting book," and by the author "the most complete assertion of the validity of the human will as against all laws, institutions, *isms*, and the like, now procurable for a quarter." Ibsen's works have been read very widely in America, and there have been almost as many interpretations as readers. This conflict of opinion will cause the liveliest curiosity to know what view is taken by Mr. Bernard Shaw, who is not only one of the keenest students of Ibsen, but one of the wittiest writers in England. He takes up the plays *seriatim*, subjects each to searching analysis, and extracts the quintessence of the whole. Nearly 200 pages. Price, paper, 25 cents.

CAPTAIN ROLAND'S PURSE: How It is Filled and How Emptied. By John Ruskin. The first of a projected series of Labor Tracts. Supplied at 37 cents per hundred.

THE STORY OF AN AFRICAN FARM. By Olive Schreiner. A romance, not of adventure, but of the intellectual life and growth of young English and German people living among the Boers and Kaffirs; picturing the mental struggles through which they passed in their evolution from orthodoxy to rationalism; and representing advanced ideas on religious and social questions. A work of remarkable power, beauty, and originality. 375 pages. Price, cloth, 60 cents; paper, 25 cents.

HEROES OF THE REVOLUTION OF '71. A souvenir picture of the Paris Commune, presenting Fifty-One Portraits of the men whose names are most prominently connected with that great uprising of the people, and adorned with mottoes from Danton, Blanqui, Pyat, Proudhon, J. Wm. Lloyd, Tridon, and August Spies. Of all the Commune souvenirs that have ever been issued this picture stands easily first. It is executed by the phototype process from a very rare collection of photographs, measures 15 inches by 24, and is printed on heavy paper for framing. Over 50 portraits for 25 cents.

THE WIND AND THE WHIRLWIND. By Wilfred Scawen Blunt. A poem worthy of a place in every man's library, and especially interesting to all victims of British tyranny and misrule. A red-line edition, printed beautifully, in large type, on fine paper, and bound in parchment covers. Elegant and cheap. 32 pages. Price, 25 cents.

BOMBS: The Poetry and Philosophy of Anarchy. By William A. Whittick. 187 pages. Price, cloth, 75 cents; paper, 50 cents.

SO THE RAILWAY KINGS ITCH FOR AN EMpire, Do They? By a "Red-Hot Striker," of Scranton, Pa. A reply to an article by William M. Grosvenor in the *International Review*. Price, 10 cents; per hundred, $4.00.

LOVE, MARRIAGE, AND DIVORCE, and the Sovereignty of the Individual. A discussion between Henry James, Horace Greeley, and Stephen Pearl Andrews. Including the final replies of Mr. Andrews, rejected by the New York *Tribune*, and a subsequent discussion, occurring twenty years later, between Mr. James and Mr. Andrews. 121 pages. Price, 35 cents.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York, N. Y.

ANARCHISM: ITS AIMS AND METHODS. An address delivered at the first public meeting of the Boston Anarchists' Club, and adopted by that organization as its authorized exposition of its principles. With an appendix giving the Constitution of the Anarchists' Club and explanatory notes regarding it. By Victor Yarros. 30 pages. Price, 5 cents; 6 copies, 25 cents; 25 copies, $1.00; 100 copies, $5.00.

GOD AND THE STATE. "One of the most eloquent pleas for liberty ever written. Paine's 'Age of Reason' and 'Rights of Man' consolidated and improved. It stirs the pulse like a trumpet call." By Michael Bakounine. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. 52 pages. Price, 15 cents.

MUTUAL BANKING: Showing the radical deficiency of the existing circulating medium, and how interest on money can be abolished. By William B. Greene. Price, 25 cents.

FREE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS: Their Nature, Essence, and Maintenance. An abridgment and rearrangement of Lysander Spooner's "Trial by Jury." Edited by Victor Yarros. 47 pages. Price, 25 cents.

WHAT IS PROPERTY? Or, an Inquiry into the Principle of Right and of Government. By P. J. Proudhon. Prefaced by a Sketch of Proudhon's Life and Works. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. A systematic, thorough, and radical discussion of the institution of property,—its basis, its history, its present status, and its destiny,—together with a detailed and startling *exposé* of the crimes which it commits, and the evils which it engenders. 500 pages octavo. Price, cloth, $2.00; paper, $1.20.

SYSTEM OF ECONOMICAL CONTRADICTIONS; Or, the Philosophy of Misery. By P. J. Proudhon. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. This work constitutes the fourth volume of the Complete Works, and is published in a style uniform with that of "What Is Property?" It discusses, in a style as novel as profound, the problems of Value, Division of Labor, Machinery, Competition, Monopoly, Taxation, and Providence, showing that economic progress is achieved by the appearance of a succession of economic forces, each of which counteracts the evils developed by its predecessor, and then, by developing evils of its own, necessitates its successor, the process to continue until a final force, corrective of the whole, shall establish a stable economic equilibrium. 469 pages octavo, in the highest style of the typographic art. Price, cloth, $2.00.

A POLITICIAN IN SIGHT OF HAVEN: Being a Protest Against Government of Man by Man. By Auberon Herbert. Price, 10 cents.

INVOLUNTARY IDLENESS. An exposition of the causes of the discrepancy existing between the supply of and the demand for labor and its products. By Hugo Bilgram. 119 pages. Price, cloth, 50 cents.

A LETTER TO GROVER CLEVELAND ON HIS False Inaugural Address, the Usurpations and Crimes of Lawmakers and Judges, and the Consequent Poverty, Ignorance, and Servitude of the People. 1886. By Lysander Spooner. 110 pages. Price, 35 cents.

THE ANARCHISTS: A Picture of Civilization at the Close of the Nineteenth Century. A poet's prose contribution to the literature of philosophic and egoistic Anarchism. The author traces his own mental development in London amid the exciting events of 1887,—the manifestations of the unemployed, the rioting at Trafalgar Square, and the executions at Chicago. The antagonism between Communism and Anarchism sharply brought out. By John Henry Mackay. Translated from the German by George Schumm. 315 pages, with portrait of the author. Price, cloth, $1.00; paper, 50 cents.

TAXATION OR FREE TRADE? A Criticism upon Henry George's "Protection or Free Trade?" By John F. Kelly. 16 pages. Price, 5 cents; 6 copies, 25 cents; 100 copies, $3.00.

SOCIALISTIC, COMMUNISTIC, MUTUALISTIC, and Financial Fragments. By W. B. Greene. Price, $1.25.

CO-OPERATION: ITS LAWS AND PRINCIPLES. An essay showing Liberty and Equity as the only conditions of true co-operation, and exposing the violations of these conditions by Rent, Interest, Profit, and Majority Rule. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Herbert Spencer. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

PROHIBITION. An essay on the relation of government to temperance, showing that prohibition cannot prohibit, and would be unnecessary if it could. By C. T. Fowler. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

THE REORGANIZATION OF BUSINESS. An essay showing how the principles of co-operation may be realized in the Store, the Bank, and the Factory. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Ralph Waldo Emerson. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

CORPORATIONS. An essay showing how the monopoly of railroads, telegraphs, etc., may be abolished without the intervention of the State. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Wendell Phillips. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

CO-OPERATIVE HOMES. An essay showing how the kitchen may be abolished and the independence of woman secured by severing the State from the Home, thereby introducing the voluntary principle into the Family and all its relationships. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Louise Michel. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

LAND TENURE. An essay showing the governmental basis of land monopoly, the futility of governmental remedies, and a natural and peaceful way of starving out the landlords. By C. T. Fowler. Containing a portrait of Robert Owen. Price, 6 cents; 2 copies, 10 cents.

THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE LAWS of Congress Prohibiting Private Mails. 1844. By Lysander Spooner. 24 pages. Price, 10 cents.

NO TREASON.—No. II. 1867. By Lysander Spooner. 16 pages. Price, 15 cents.

NO TREASON.—No. VI. Showing that the constitution is of no authority. 1870. By Lysander Spooner. 59 pages. Price, 25 cents.

ILLEGALITY OF THE TRIAL OF JOHN W. WEBster. Containing the substance of the author's larger work, "Trial by Jury," now out of print. 1850. By Lysander Spooner. 16 pages. Price, 10 cents

NATURAL LAW; Or, the Science of Justice. A treatise on natural law, natural justice, natural rights, natural liberty, and natural society; showing that all legislation whatsoever is an absurdity, a usurpation, and a crime. Part First, 1882. By Lysander Spooner. 81 pages. Price, 10 cents.

A LETTER TO THOMAS F. BAYARD. Challenging his right—and that of all the other so-called senators and representatives in Congress—to exercise any legislative power whatever over the people of the United States. By Lysander Spooner. Price, 3 cents.